

Date	2/27 P. 1 / 1 pages
To	Steve Yeager
From	Charles Gardiner
Co./Dept.	Co. PAM
Phone	916
Fax	(916) 454-9780

CALFED WOR

## COMMENTS FROM THE WORKSHOP AND PANEL DISCUSSION

### COMMENTS FROM THE INTRODUCTION SESSION

- How is the no-action alternative being developed and what is the timeframe for its completion?
- The listing of Winter-Run and Delta smelt were instrumental in forcing this process. How is flood control being coordinated relative to habitat needs for these species?
- What assumptions are being made to account for changes in sea level, earthquake potential, and climatic change?
- What assumptions are being made regarding south Delta barriers?

### COMMENTS FROM THE PANEL DISCUSSION

#### Tom Zuckerman - Representing the Central Delta Water Agency

- Refreshing to look at a document that starts off treating the Delta as a treasure rather than a hinderance to people getting what they want
- Core actions and alternatives are trying to enhance features that are native to the Delta. This approach minimizes the need for large solutions
- Leaving more water of good quality in the Delta provides more tools for rectifying resource issues
- Diverting water upstream of the Delta has many demerits (political, practical, scientific)
- Fix can't include an isolated facility or upstream transfers. Approaches that deal with the Delta as a common pool of water that are worthy of further study
- Consensus is developing around habitat and levee issues. Concentrate on things for which there is common agreement. Don't want prior political contests to arise again

- Important to look at the Delta from a safe-yield point of view. Is there a way to build more storage or increase supply so that the expectations of people who rely upon the system can be met?
- Need to think of priorities for use before selecting projects

**Adrienne Alvord - California Alliance for Family Farmers**

- Something to like and dislike in all of the alternatives
- Solutions should not have negative socioeconomic or environmental impacts on rural communities. State and Feds must guarantee mitigation of impacts that do arise - part of true cost of the solution
- Need better understanding of how alternatives will be implemented before they can be evaluated for their effects
- Favor Bay-Delta habitat and upstream restoration
- Want two principles incorporated into solutions where possible: central role in habitat restoration and improvement activities should be given to local communities and labor and implement restoration by working with existing landowners
- Encouragement of wildlife friendly agricultural practices is good
- Favor reduction in effects of diversions on fish, improvements in system reliability, reduction in export reliance
- Urban demand management needs to be approached far more aggressively
- Too much emphasis on transfers to improve supply predictability. Need more discussion of the effects of the different types of transfers. Transfers are not a yes or no decision because there are many types. We don't know how much surplus water exists to be transferred. Water rights, transaction costs, and monitoring are issues. Third party impacts is key to us - taking water out of communities where the community depends on water availability for their livelihoods. The critical question is how transfers would be implemented
- Very concerned about rural economic and environmental consequences if document is interpreted as an endorsement of water marketing
- Alternatives 4 and 5 seem most workable as starting points because of their emphasis on habitat restoration

- Demand management emphasis is good, but the alternatives place too much emphasis on transfers
- Don't favor solutions that call for large, new conveyance facilities until there is a better idea of how water would be used
- A new approach to water management is needed. Past technical fixes have failed in some way. None of the core alternatives deal with our priorities for water or how it should be used. Should be moving toward reform, rationalization, and increased democratic inclusiveness in water policy decisionmaking

**Gary Bobker - San Francisco Bay Institute**

- CALFED staff has done good job of tying pieces together
- No restoration activities downstream of the Delta must be expanded
- Alternatives address water diversion management, but options are centered on Delta export. Need to look at how to manipulate or modify timing or amount of upstream diversions to provide ecosystem benefits
- Flow volume and timing have not been integrated into the alternatives. Quantifying flow volumes and timing is premature at this time, but important to identify the desired states - a narrative description of where we want to get to in order to evaluate how alternatives provide opportunities to enhance flow conditions for the environment
- Premature to start comparing one alternative to another. More foundation work is needed to identify and articulate objectives from which a solid core of management actions can be built to move toward the objectives
- Growing consensus for comprehensive ecosystem restoration and demand management as core element of all the alternatives. This approach isn't adequately represented in the alternatives as yet and could be the most important thing to work on. The tools are there, but they are not integrated into a master ecosystem recover plan needed for a successful long-term solution. Need to start with this vision and take an aggressive approach
- Some key elements are not included in all the alternatives that reflect the core action approach. Many ecosystem elements are simply restatements of the objectives. Need to articulate in much greater detail how far we want to go. Need indications of the scope of activity (i.e. percentages) or need performance measures. Can't evaluate adequacy of any alternatives without this
- Demand management must be incorporated throughout all of the alternatives. Only a few alternatives have the full range of aggressive conservation,

reclamation, financial measures, etc. needed for successful demand management approach. False dichotomy set up between demand management and other approaches - not a good way to proceed. Need to build on demand management with other approaches in order to compare benefits

- Aggressive approaches to source control for protecting water quality are an extremely important element that is lacking from some of the alternatives
- Concerned about assuming that an easily identified threshold level at which the ecosystem is safe exists and that all the water in the system is surplus to that. Will be difficult to ever make that determination

**Richard Denton - Contra Costa Water District**

- Alternatives do cover full range of solutions from the "insufficient to the wildly ambitious"
- Alternatives should be bundled in an additive or cumulative manner to help with understanding. Build alternatives up with particular actions/approaches from common foundations
- Few alternatives address pumping when there is water available and reducing diversions when there isn't
- Like upstream and downstream storage, through Delta/common pool - helps guarantee that in-Delta quality is maintained
- Dislike #8 and #9 - potential for degraded Delta water quality
- Not too interested in in-Delta storage - release of organics could be a problem
- Storage should be upstream of the Delta to provide mitigation and environmental flows for the Delta. Downstream storage also needed to allow timing flexibility for diversions
- Need to link environmental restoration with facilities and water supply enhancement
- Concerned about isolated facilities. Need to study in detail. If infeasible, idea needs to be discarded as an alternative
- Upstream and downstream storage is implied in the alternatives, but needs to be stated specifically
- A joint water users/through Delta alternative is an improvement on alternative #11. It has a combination of Delta restoration and improving conveyance ability

through the Delta. This idea deserves detailed evaluation

**B.J. Miller - Consultant for Delta-Mendota/San Luis Water Authority**

- Strongly supports the process - its essential
- Support large scale implementation of ecosystem restoration in, upstream, and downstream of the Delta
- Support vigorous program of demand management
- Too little attention on decline in fish food species in areas that are unaffected by CVP operations. Could be a toxics problem. If so, ecosystem restoration will not be successful
- Process should focus on the Delta, not try to solve greater California supply problems
- Much excess water in the system that isn't being captured. Need to build something to capture that water
- Most alternatives fail to address the three key objectives of water users: 1) opportunity to get hold of excess water to meet reasonable future needs; 2) not enough emphasis on drinking water quality; and 3) levee stability problems (normal failures and earthquake-induced failure). Rehabilitating levees as proposed doesn't address earthquake failure
- If the Delta problem is solved, the whole system will open up to transfers because because water buyers and sellers will have more confidence that use of the water will not be restricted

**Nat Bingham - Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations**

- Have captured general ranges of possible alternatives
- Inverse relationship between Delta exports and fish productivity
- Don't get distracted by an illusion that there is a magic window in fish migration when fish are not there and pumping is safe. Be cautious with alternatives that assume that pumping is safe because fish aren't present
- Using habitat restoration to improve fish production and reduce impacts from entrainment caused by pumping is not a sound way to manage fisheries. Better approach is to keep fish away from intakes or to conserve water to improve certainty of the system and thus help stabilize fisheries

- Alternatives do not generally enhance upstream water supply reliability or resolve environmental problems upstream, but focus on increasing reliability for southern California
- Improving water supplies for exporters without regard to upstream water users may direct most of the impact for temperature control, releases, Delta water quality, or habitat restoration primarily to upstream users - this is not equitable
- Affordability very critical in northern California where ability to pay for elaborate solutions is minimal, especially where little benefit is derived and additional impacts are possible
- Developing additional water supplies in northern California is critical to the durability of a Delta solution
- Alternatives must be consistent with water rights and area of origin laws

#### COMMENTS FROM THE CLOSING SESSION

- Will there be enough time in the schedule to complete all the activities? How flexible is the schedule?
- When are comments due?
- What is the relationship between CALFED and SB900?
- Narrow the range of alternatives by cutting and combining from the bottom up
- In costing out alternatives, will you evaluate economics and benefits derived?
- By the time you get to your three alternatives for environmental assessment, will you have put together the cost information? Will you have established allocation and repayment procedures?

- Commercial *and* recreational fisheries have an impact on anadromous fish. Core action on page three should reflect this. Very concerned about over fishing and protected species
- Strongly supports additional monitoring and adaptive management

**Pete Rhodes - Metropolitan Water District**

- CALFED Program has provided a good start towards a long-range solution
- Real-time monitoring and philosophy of adaptive management is good
- Urban water users need three primary things from a long-term fix: 1) a more reliable water supply; 2) improved water quality; and 3) a sustainable biological system
- Reliability should be based on storage during wet years and conservation during droughts. Conveyance and storage are critical during wetter periods. What will the rules be for moving water through the system? Evaluation of effectiveness of all alternatives for conveyance and storage needs to be refined
- Drinking water standards must be met. Source quality and treatment are the biggest issues
- Need comprehensive framework for restoring the Delta system. This is not reflected in the alternatives as strongly as necessary
- CALFED Program needs to integrate existing activities and provide a framework for management of the ecosystem
- Program needs strong provisions to deal with pollution, toxics, legal and illegal fishing, watershed management, and other non-flow factors
- Amount and distribution of habitat restoration is too limited. Greater variety of restoration approaches is needed
- Blend extensive habitat restoration with a through Delta alternative. The alternatives don't reflect this and it needs to be evaluated

**Jeff Jaraczski - Northern California Water Association**

- The alternatives or a variation of them can provide a comprehensive, affordable, consensus alternative that addresses water supply and environmental issues equitably